

MINUTES
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
1,868th Meeting



6:00 p.m. October 14, 2004
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

**APPROVED AS PRESENTED AT THE
MAY 5, 2005 MEETING**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Norton, Singletary

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Stephens

STAFF PRESENT: Gutierrez, Planning Director
Aaron, Principal Planner
Jenkins, Diane, Senior Planner
Brenes, Associate Planner
Smith, Deputy City Attorney
Andrade, Stenographer

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:

Chair Agnew called the Planning Commission meeting. He announced that this was an information workshop and that no decisions would be made today. The audience will have an opportunity at the end of the presentation to make any comments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	<u>DISCUSSION CALENDAR</u>	3
1.	<u>GENERAL PLAN 2025 PROGRAM - WORKSHOP #2:</u> This workshop will include a comprehensive review of the following elements of the General Plan 2025: Circulation and Community Mobility, Open Space and Conservation, Housing, Public Facilities and Infrastructure, Public Safety, Noise and Implementation Plan.	3
B.	<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	12

A. **DISCUSSION CALENDAR** - 6:00 p.m.

1. **GENERAL PLAN 2025 PROGRAM - WORKSHOP #2:** This workshop will include a comprehensive review of the following elements of the General Plan 2025: Circulation and Community Mobility, Open Space and Conservation, Housing, Public Facilities and Infrastructure, Public Safety, Noise and Implementation Plan.

Craig Aaron, Principal Planner, welcomed everyone to the workshop and introduced the consultants, Janet Harvey and Laura Stetson with Cotton Bridges Associates.

Laura Stetson gave a summary of the previous workshop.

Janet Harvey presented the Circulation Element overview. The Circulation Element is required to look at the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the Land Use Element of the Plan. The Land Use Element has to support the roadways and the roads have to support decisions made in the Land Use Element.

Commissioner Densmore asked if the alternatives outlined by Ms. Harvey were the only alternatives considered. He felt that this question would come up in the future.

Ms. Harvey replied that the advisory committee and city staff worked together on this. There were other alternatives but these were the ones they looked at in detail.

Commissioner Brown indicated that Commissioner Leonard and himself have been a part of the General Plan and that the alternatives presented came about because of a study that was done. It was rather apparent, as a result of this study, that the Cajalco Corridor will be a major relief to this whole situation should it come to pass.

Ms. Harvey continued with the presentation.

Commissioner Leonard commented that there are a number of streets that still seem to be in the failing category mentioned. They all have a common characteristic in that they are connections to freeways. He asked at what point they could see a free flow of the freeway system other than the peak hours which would create a disincentive to cut across traffic. He focused on the 91, 60 and 215 and asked if the modeling was based on the ultimate improvements on the books today. He said that even with those improvements, the system is still heavily congested and causes an incentive for people to cut across.

Ms. Harvey replied that a free flow on the freeway system would happen if Cal-Trans could be convinced to widen them. She felt that the Cajalco, also known as Mid-County Parkway, improvements would help traffic but would not solve the problem. There will be congestion and regional traffic on the local roads. As the freeway improvements are implemented they will have more of an incentive to stay on the freeway because they'll want to get there as quickly as they can.

Commissioner Leonard inquired what the Washington / Alessandro Committee's recommendation was with regard to the connection between Chicago and Central.

Laura Stetson stated that the Washington /t Alessandro Committee's recommendation was to connect Central Avenue. It was also the recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Committee to connect Central from its current terminus across Fairview to Central. Those recommendations were taken forward to a study session with the Planning Commission and City Council. The General Plan Team was given the direction from the City

Council to not include the Central Avenue connection as part of the Circulation Plan which is why it is not shown or included in the final model of the circulation plan.

Commissioner Leonard asked what the benefits and problems were with that connection.

Ms. Harvey explained that it improved the traffic conditions at the Arlington / Alessandro intersection but it shifted them further up the street. You had an improvement in one area but it had a decrease in level of service in another area.

Commissioner Brown agreed that it would relieve the intersection at Arlington and Alessandro but disagreed with their second statement. He also felt that this recommendation ought to be part of the opening hearing, if not the plan, because it was unanimously recommended by the Committee. He stated that this had to be made an issue because it was to the benefit of the public at large and not the privilege of a few to turn it down.

Ms. Stetson stated that the information would be presented as part of the staff report going forward for the public hearing process.

Commissioner Brown also recalled that there had been a lengthy discussion regarding the potential of a beltway around the City during the review of Cajalco Rd. He noted that he did not find this in the plan either.

Ms. Stetson explained that it was not called a beltway, such as the classic beltway around Washington, D.C. There is a beltway formed, if and when the Cajalco Road goes through. She stated that it was not termed a beltway but it would function essentially as such.

Commissioner Brown expressed his concern that it should be mentioned. The Committee had a lengthy discussion regarding this and it was quite visionary on the part of the members. Should Cajalco go through the City ought to be on record to say that it would relieve the pressure around the City.

Commissioner Densmore commented that based on the presentation, the City should simply support the County in the regional effort which includes Orange County and other areas of Southern California to push that corridor with all haste. Other than supporting this recommendation, the City of Riverside is not in control of their own future.

Tom Boyd, Deputy Public Works Director, stated that he did not agree with that statement. He felt that Riverside was a major player and must find a way to live with its neighboring jurisdictions. The traffic modeling has tried to balance the impact to Riverside residents by encouraging regional traffic and also the benefits of trying to improve the flow of Riverside residents to and from the 91. He pointed out that even if regional traffic is eliminated there is still a considerable amount of traffic of Riverside residents trying to get to the freeway. The Mid-County Parkway is a major transportation element and has significant benefits. He felt that the plan understated the benefits.

Commissioner Brown pointed out that the annexation plan for this City is going toward Cajalco.

Mr. Boyd agreed and stated that the Cajalco Corridor is within the City's Sphere of Influence under this plan.

Commissioner Densmore asked if the General Plan presented was a theoretical model of how best the City can move forward, regardless of political will or is it going to be influenced by current politics with regard to what issues are included in the plan. He referred to the issue regarding Central Avenue and noted that the Council's

decision was at the beginning of the process instead of at the end. In the presentation the Commission has been informed that the Council removed this recommendation at a stage where it should be before the public.

Ms. Stetson said that the General Plan as currently presented is what will move forward through the public hearing process. It is a recommendation, based on a lot of input over the past year and a half. Through the public hearing process changes can be and will be made to the plan per the Commission's recommendations which will move forward to the City Council and ultimately the City Council making a decision as to what that plan should be.

She added that through the whole process a lot of information was provided through the Technical Advisory Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee and a series of other topic groups. The process also included study sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council. It was through these particular sessions that direction was given as to what should be included in the plan and moved forward to the public hearing process.

Commissioner Densmore said he was hearing the two individuals that served on the committee were surprised by what was in or not in the plan tonight. It appeared that the Plan was being shaped in all sorts of ways so that by the time it gets to the public hearing it may or may not be what the committee's recommended. He also expressed his concerns regarding parking.

Ms. Stetson explained that parking was a policy issue. This was not something that was discussed but it is certainly something that can be discussed by this body as part of the public hearing process. She noted that the parking issue was largely regulated through the Zoning Code and is addressed in a general sense in the General Plan.

Commissioner Norton said she understood the need for a specific plan on Overlook and 91 freeway connection, however, how quickly can that be tied to the General Plan. She stated that she personally did not like the idea of things trailing. If this specific plan is needed, will it trail behind or can it be incorporated into the General Plan process.

Ms. Stetson replied that as part of the Commission's recommendation to the City Council, they can include a recommendation that the specific plan study be done as quickly as possible, even setting time frames.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed but staff does not want to delay the General Plan for the specific plan study. He clarified for the Commission that one of the recommendations is that Overlook Parkway not be extended until such time as a connection past Washington Street to the 91 freeway is completed.

Commissioner Singletary stated as a matter of information, since the Central Avenue extension was mentioned, that his family owns a piece within that missing connection. This is only a workshop and the Commission will not be voting on this but for the record, at such time the Commission does vote, he will be abstaining.

Commissioner Leonard noted that Riverside is becoming a significant urban setting through the General Plan process. Riverside is making the transition from suburban community to an urban core. He did not feel it was urban enough at this time to justify the kind of major transportation facilities that would cause major improvements to the circulation system. He asked if there were other options available, light rail was mentioned earlier.

Ms. Harvey said that the City needs to have the ridership to support funds being spent on those type of facilities. This is something Riverside must keep an eye on and in the future those possibilities will be more achievable.

Commissioner Comer disclosed that he lives on Arroyo and that the Central Avenue link is something that would affect him. His mother-in-law lives at the corner of Victoria and Madison which would also affect him. He will abstain from voting on either of those issues in the future. In his opinion, those are two links that should have been put into the General Plan previously. He felt that, regardless of political pressures, those extensions should be included in the General Plan. He also suggested it would be prudent to expand Magnolia Avenue so that traffic does not go down Victoria or Lincoln as a bypass. He asked Mr. Boyd regarding the proposed extension for getting from Arlington up to the 15 Freeway and why it was not included in the plan.

Mr. Boyd responded that the extension was included in the traffic modeling but it is outside the City's sphere so that it is not discussed. The connection is part of the TUMF program. The County of Riverside is requesting money to begin the initial phase of that work.

Commissioner Comer stated that the proposed six lanes on Cajalco might as well be a full blown freeway. He asked if this had been reviewed as part of the traffic modeling. He also asked if this was going to connect to another freeway.

Ms. Harvey explained that they looked at Cajalco as a limited access roadway because that was the recommendation from the RCIP, the County and the CETAP.

Commissioner Leonard said that it was his understanding it would be one connection to Orange County but that there were other east/west connections like 74 that are being upgraded right now.

Commissioner Brown indicated that the committee spent a large amount of time studying the Overlook Parkway proposal. He would totally agree that they need to proceed with this portion of the study. As previously stated, nothing can be done until the study shows where the traffic will go and how to connect to the 91 Freeway.

Commissioner Norton inquired if adding language to the City's Sphere of Influence would show a stronger support to encourage the County to work with the City with regard to the Cajalco Corridor. The City would be in a position of making a decision if its Sphere of Influence went out further.

Mr. Boyd said he was not sure what language to suggest stronger than "encourage". The Mid-County Parkway is becoming a reality and with the combined efforts of Moreno Valley, Corona, City of Riverside and Federal legislators, it has an executive order as a priority project in Washington. The region needs to work through the environmental document and preliminary design and start thinking how to fund the project and build it. He felt "encouraged" was a good General Plan term in light of the fact that the Mid-County Parkway is becoming a reality.

Commissioner Kurani said he has heard several times tonight that Riverside is not as dense to promote internal circulation in the form of mass transit. He felt that we need to encourage people to use the transit right now to the different hubs being created. They should not have to wait until something major happens, it should be provided in the beginning or at least included in a policy.

Ms. Harvey clarified that her comments were not meant for the established kind of services such as the bus. When you try to develop something new such as light rail, you need to have the customer base to use it. She said that the existing bus is a lower cost and can be justified easier. She did not mean to imply that there should be no expansion of bus service until you get denser but for the other types of things you have to justify it better.

Commissioner Kurani agreed and stated that it did not need to be capital intensive. He suggested getting people used to using the bus to do their shopping or to go to an entertainment place. He said very simply to encourage residents from the get go and not wait until 2025 and find out they should have thought about this in 2005.

Commissioner Leonard asked staff to elaborate on what the plan is promoting in terms of addressing and encouraging railroad grade separations.

Ms. Stetson referred to the policy on page CCM-38, that says “aggressively pursue grade separated rail crossings to alleviate traffic congestion and associated air quality and noise impacts”. She said that the policy did not prioritize but that the detail could be addressed in the Implementation Program.

Commissioner Leonard asked if there was a policy in the General Plan for Riverside to work with surrounding communities affected by train travel. He noted it may take more than one policy.

Mr. Boyd replied that they would be open to any changes in wording.

Commissioner Brown agreed that the General Plan needed to include stronger policies. The City has indicated that this is a problem of paramount proportions but it also needs to be reflected in the General Plan.

Ms. Stetson reiterated that they would welcome the Commission's suggestions with regard to additional language. Also as the Commission reviews the Implementation Plan, if there are specific directives they would like to have included in terms of timing and strategies, those would also be welcome.

Commissioner Singletary said he was in favor of any language. He also understood the cost of a crossing to be \$15,000,000 and Riverside has 27 crossings. He pointed out that the Railroad's primary concern is being competitive with the trucks. There are currently 80 train trips a day and by 2025, there will be 250 train trips. The language can be included in the General Plan but the fact remains that the railroads have the right-of-way and they are not going to participate unless there is something in it for them.

Chair Agnew asked the audience if there was anyone present wishing to comment. He reminded everyone that this was not a public hearing and no decisions would be made today.

Raymond Gage, Highgrove resident, asked for the Commissions assistance with regard to the Springbrook Estates development. This development has three possible grade crossings and the developer is not being required to pay for them. He asked for the Commission's support and encouraged them to send their letter of support to the 5th District representative.

Pete Bollinger addressed existing street light conditions and recommended better signal light coordination at peak traffic times along Van Buren and Alessandro. He also asked that someone look into the dangerous situation of Wood Road and Van Buren Boulevard. There is an unpaved road section that he would like taken care of.

Bill Wilkman, President of Victoria Avenue Forever, stated that their Board has not had an opportunity to review the General Plan in relation to Victoria Avenue. They will be sending their comments to staff at a later date. He wanted to go on record that they are vitally interested in the Overlook Parkway extension and would definitely want to be a part of any specific plan process.

Ernest Pintor, 4260 Isabella, agreed with the commissioners comments regarding parking. He suggested incorporating provisions for underground parking into the traffic studies. He did not feel parking structures, 3-4 stories high, added anything to the community.

Mary Humboldt, 7407 Dufferin Avenue, expressed her concerns regarding the bus system. She felt the buses needed to be smaller, more efficient and more accommodating to people. She also stated she was opposed to the Overlook Parkway connection.

Commissioner Brown asked staff to inform Mr. Bollinger regarding the work that has been approved at Van Buren and Wood Road. He felt that staff was doing a lot of work but not taking credit for it.

Mr. Boyd stated that the City has a project to widen the south bound direction of Wood Road, south of Van Buren. There is a bottle neck there and staff is working with a developer on the north bound lanes to get the intersection finished. The project has been presented to the Planning Commission and is still under discussion but staff is working towards that direction.

Patrick Hsu, 1363 Linden, thanked staff and stated that they are playing a very important role for the City. He was concerned that the zone changes could double the density and was not sure how this would impact the City of Riverside and its traffic volume. He also commented that staff's analysis should not end at the City limits. The City should work with the County and consider the areas outside the City's boundary as well.

David Kessinger, resident, commented that the public transit inter-county had deteriorated over the years.

The Commission took a five minute break.

Commissioner Leonard said that the comments that have been made on parking have caused him to revisit the policies. Usually you do not hear about parking at the General Plan level but because the policies are at a project level, they tend to be reactive. He asked if there was an opportunity to include a guiding principal or two in terms of encouraging a strategy for community parking areas in the business districts throughout the city.

Ms. Stetson answered that if the Commission believes there are appropriate policies that are missing, they can be introduced at the public hearing process.

Commissioner Leonard added that the policies, except for the ride sharing, tend to be at a project level stage. He suggested encouraging community parking facilities in different business districts throughout the City. The policy can't get too specific but at the same time there can be at least some guidelines to look at this in advance of where development is expected to occur in a concentrated way.

Ms. Stetson presented an overview of the Housing Element. The Housing Element must be updated every five years under the State law. The key issue that this Housing Element addresses is how to ensure that there is adequate sites for all types of housing to meet the needs of the community over the next 5 year period. An important point is that the Housing Element does not commit the City to provide a certain number of housing units over the five year period.

Commissioner Leonard inquired if the table 3.7 reflected the single family residential uses in the RC Zone.

Ms. Stetson informed the Commission that there are new policies and procedures that will become part of the Zoning Code but with regard to design review in the RC Zone, she deferred to staff.

Mr. Aaron answered affirmatively.

Ms. Stetson continued with a presentation on the Public Safety Element. This Element addresses public safety issues to minimize the potential damage that could occur from both natural recurring hazards as well as human caused hazards. The Safety Element addresses fire and police and the need to ensure that the very high levels of service that are currently provided continue to be provided into the future. The idea of precinct based policing is also mentioned in the Safety Element.

Commissioner Comer brought up the potential for brush fires at the river bottom and along the Sycamore Canyon Open Space Park. The zoning, particularly in the RC Zone prohibits landscaping which creates a fire break in these areas. He asked if this issue had been addressed in the Public Safety Element.

Ms. Stetson answered that it was not addressed to the detail indicated by Commissioner Comer. The General Plan level addresses issues to ensure there is adequate protection. This is an issue that can be brought up and addressed in detail as part of the Implementation Program.

Mr. Aaron also added that this was addressed indirectly through the Open Space Element, which reenforces some of the provisions of the Grading Ordinances where there are areas such as the RC Zone that limit the pad areas to a certain size. The Grading Ordinance currently requires that the ungraded areas be left in a natural state. Staff has had discussions with the Fire Department in the past in which they have indicated it is not a major concern to them so long as certain minimal defensible space area is left around the homes. He recognized that there is an issue and a danger to balance against the environmental issues. If the Commission wishes to bring it up as part of the public hearing as something to be included in the Implementation Plan, it would be a fair point.

Ms. Stetson said there was a policy on page 36 of the Public Safety Element which is broad but talks about stringent brush clearance requirements in areas subject to wild land fire hazards. If this is of concern, it can be taken further as either policy or more direct implementation.

Commissioner Comer pointed out that it would be in conflict with the RC Zone.

Mr. Gutierrez agreed and stated that staff will discuss this with the Fire Department between now and the public hearings.

Commissioner Comer expressed his concern with regard to the distance police must travel and the lack of circulation patterns. The police units are scattered around the City and traffic is becoming worse in the community.

Ms. Stetson said that this may be part of the push for precinct based policing, not just the neighborhood aspect but making sure the police can respond in a timely manner.

Commissioner Densmore said that everyone has seen how easily modern communities can be isolated due to natural disasters in southern California. He said his following comment was more a statement than a question but asked how much the Public Safety and Traffic Circulation Elements would mesh together so that the public concerns about the aesthetics of punching through certain roads or the vigorous support of the Cajalco Corridor are addressed. How much is the argument for public safety going to be used as opposed to just lessening traffic concerns at a certain intersection.

Ms. Stetson restated that what Commissioner Densmore suggested is that there is more than one reason for making certain road connections, not just to help traffic flow smoothly but to help traffic flow smoothly in the event there is a disruption of the 91 or other critical arterial for emergency evacuation purposes.

Commissioner Kurani touched on the language for special consideration to historic resources.

Commissioner Leonard wanted to know if there was a means to include a policy encouraging preservation, and if that were not possible, the relocation or possible salvage of an historic structure.

Ms. Stetson said that the detail as to what the City should do with regard to specific programs is in the Implementation Program. Staff can look at the Historic Preservation Element to see if there is any existing cross over and parallel measures.

Ms. Stetson reviewed the Noise Element. The Noise Element addresses steps the City can take or is looking to take over the long term to minimize Noise/Land Use impacts. To do this, there are policies to minimize noise levels from point source.

Commissioner Comer pointed out that Table 2, needs to include rail noise. He was not referring to the rail noise of the trains running up and down the tracks but the horns. He said that 5-6 months ago the City installed automatic horns at several crossings, one at Olivewood and Cridge. He lives up that arroyo and prior to that being installed it wasn't an issue. He did not feel that the sound areas shown today were correct and that it should include a line item outlining rail. He asked if the noise contours would be corrected.

Ms. Stetson explained that this was a composite noise picture that accounts for all associated noise from rail operations and was completed by the noise consultant they retained. This isn't a point in time this is the average noise over a 24 hour period with a weight given to night time noise.

Commissioner Comer asked if the consultant that worked on the noise study could address this specifically when the Commission reviewed the Noise Element again.

Ms. Stetson stated affirmatively.

Commissioner Densmore asked to what extent the Commission will be able to address, what very probably will be very vocal concerns from the Orangecrest area regarding anticipated cargo flights out of March.

Ms. Stetson replied that this is a very difficult question in that there is currently urban development in an aircraft overflight area. There are only certain ways that airplanes can fly into and out of that airport. In terms of changing traffic patterns, that is a difficult task to accomplish.

Commissioner Densmore agreed and felt that more than flight patterns, the discussions will be on the frequency, time and types of planes. He stated that he was just trying to anticipate what the responses will be.

Mr. Gutierrez also added that the timing couldn't be better or worse depending on the perspective. He thought that Ms. Stetson summarized it well and referred them to Policy 3.4 on page 35. This refers to something called a Joint Land use Study (JLUS) that is currently underway. The March JPA is in the process of hiring a consultant to do this Joint Land Use Study which will look at echos, noise contours, safety contours, etc. The end product will be a map, overlay zone that would go over the entire influence area of the Base. This will have definite policies that deal with the land uses allowed in certain areas. This will address Commissioner

Densmore's concerns, unfortunately it is not available at this time. The General Plan cannot be delayed but staff has recognized that this Study is coming and will provide that level of detail.

Commissioner Leonard noted that there has been a great job done on the Noise Element. He asked about the leaf blowers at 6:00 and inquired if they had seen a General Plan provide certain policy or guidelines to address this issue citywide on an overall level.

Ms. Stetson replied that she had not, most General Plans stay at the macro level and address minimizing neighborhood noise and always refers back to the Noise Ordinance.

Commissioner Comer stated that with regard to rail noise, if the noise area were increased in the survey, it would help with the rail issues. He felt that the noise exposure was greater than the contours shown.

Ms. Stetson said that something important to remember when looking at General Plan is that you are looking at a gross analysis level of how the trains are impacting an area. There may be people who live in different areas and do not fit within these noise contours zones but they are certainly being impacted by the noise from the trains. It might not be at the levels that are indicated on the map.

Commissioner Comer stated that what he would like to accomplish is to increase those contour areas so that there is further impetus to develop grade crossings.

Ms. Stetson explained that this is something that would require a much more detailed noise study than typically done at a General Plan level. Certainly if the City is looking for ammunition in fighting for additional grade crossings, a very detailed noise study would probably be another arrow in the quiver. This was a General Plan level noise study as to how future trains would impact the City. She reiterated that the contours do not reflect a one time point source nor a single event noise, it is an average train noise over a 24 hour period with a weighted average for night time noise.

Commissioner Leonard asked if the data existed where the Commission could get a look at what the noise contour looks like at 3:00 am or 4:00 am , when all the background noise is gone.

Ms. Stetson said that she would see if the information was available and could be compiled into a map. She agreed that noise would be a tremendous issue at the public hearing process. It would appear that providing more detailed information would be helpful.

Commissioner Brown suggested that they include a footnote by N -9, March Noise Contour which indicates that the aciuiz they are using is from 1998. He also suggested that it include a notation that the information does not include the C-17. The concerns are based on the old airplanes and not the C-17, which will be at March, which knocks down the noise extemporaneously as well as lowers the anti-toxins. He felt this would answer a lot of the questions individuals may ask.

Ms. Stetson presented the Open Space and Conservation Element. She noted that in addition to land resources, the Open Space and Conservation Element addresses energy, water and other critical components of the environment that help create Riverside. She stated that it was brought to her attention tonight by a member of the audience that the map needs to accurately reflect the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan and some wildlife corridors. She pointed out that there is still a map missing from the Element, the MSHCP cell map. They are looking to combine this with the wildlife maps so that it accurately reflects the work that has been done by the County in cooperation with the surrounding cities.

Commissioner Densmore commented that one of the continual issues faced by the Commission are proposals to subdivide land in an open space area. How can this help the Commission make decisions one way or another where it may be perfectly legal to subdivide but in subdividing, it reduces open space or compromises an animal keeping zone. The City is losing open space but the Commission is helpless to do anything about it.

Ms. Stetson explained that the Element points out various critical open space areas. She said that they need to balance the City's policies and goals to preserve open space areas versus the City's need to provide housing as well. This can be part of the decision making process, in light of how a particular project sits with the open space and conservation goals and other maps that exist. This General Plan cannot be put on the shelf once adopted, it must be kept with the Commission when reviewing development applications.

Ms. Stetson continued with the Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element. She informed the Commission that the Historic Preservation Element was not something that is being considered as part of this General Plan update but was included so that they could see how it fit in the context of the plan.

Chair Agnew asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to comment on these issues.

Mary Humbolt, 7407 Dufferin, commended Commissioner Comer for bringing up the train horn noise levels. She hoped that the General Plan addressed this issue and had a realistic chart on what the noise level is. With regard to the 28 pods that have been marked for the 4-5 story apartment houses. She did not feel that the services, roads, etc. were being put in place to meet this projected density. She did not see how the current infrastructure would take care of these 75,000 new people. She was not comfortable with the Transportation Element but was more uncomfortable with the super high density aspect of the plan.

Arlee Montalvo, resident of Riverside, stated she was representing the Riverside/Corona Resource Conservation District. She would like to address the issue of wild land interface, landscaping and natural vegetation. One of the things they have been trying to educate the public on is that development should provide defensible space within the developments. It is a very critical planning issue in these areas. If the development plan were done correctly and provided this defensible space there would not be as much of a problem in terms of encroaching on the natural vegetation. The other issue is that there can be fuel modification within the natural vegetation zones adjacent to the defensible space. They would like to work with the City to help provide information about the appropriate sorts of native plant species to plant within these areas to make it more fire safe so that it is still compatible with the development and natural environment.

Len Nunny, addressed the Commission. He thought the Open Space Element was good. One thing that was not raised in the Element was light pollution. There are a number of city's such as Arizona and Tucson where this issue is taken very seriously. There has been a dramatic change in the Riverside since he has been here in that there used to be dark areas within the City. This doesn't mean reducing public safety, light can still be directed down without having strong light coming up.

There was no one else in the audience requesting to speak. Chair Agnew adjourned the meeting at 9:09 pm.

B. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment to the November 4, 2004 meeting at 9:00 am.